REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 21, 33, and 36 have been amended and claim 41 has been added. Thus, claims 21-41 are now active in the application. In view of the above amendments and following remarks, further examination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, the Examiner stated that the limitation as claimed in claim 32 must be shown or the feature canceled. This objection is respectfully traversed. The focusing optical system is shown in Figure 1 between light source 101 and wavelength conversion element 103 as element 102. Element 102 is defined as a focusing optical system on page 5, line 32, of the specification, and the focusing optical system is described on page 4, lines 4-8, of the specification.

In item 1 on pages 2-5 of the Office Action, claims 21-24, 26, and 29-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hayakawa *et al.* (US 2002/0009102 A1). This rejection is believed to be inapplicable to amended independent claim 21, and thus inapplicable to claims 22-24, 26, and 29-35 which depend therefrom, for the reasons hereinbelow.

In items 2-6 on pages 5-10 of the Office Action, claims 25, 27-28, and 36-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayakawa *et al.* as applied to claim 21, variously in view of Williams *et al.* (US 6,763,042), Sakata *et al.* (US 2004/0120647), Furukawa *et al.* (US 2004/0027648), and Kitaoka *et al.* (US 6,845,113). These rejections are believed to be inapplicable to the claims which now depend from amended independent claim 21 for the following reasons.

For the Examiner's convenience, a discussion of the arrangement and advantages of the invention as recited will be made with exemplary reference to drawing Figure 1. However, reference to any particular portion of the present application is not intended to limit the scope of the claims to any particular embodiment.

Claim 21 recites a coherent light source comprising: a light source 101; a wavelength conversion element 103 that converts part of a fundamental wave emitted from light source 101 into a higher harmonic wave; a wavelength selecting filter (constituted by a band pass filter 104 and a

dichroic mirror 105 in Figure 1) that has narrow-band transmission characteristics with respect to the part of the fundamental wave not converted into the higher harmonic wave, and has transmission characteristics with respect to the higher harmonic wave; wherein the part of the fundamental wave emitted from wavelength conversion element 103 but not converted into the higher harmonic wave is fed back to the light source by the wavelength selecting filter, the higher harmonic wave is emitted to the outside after passing through the wavelength selecting filter, the wavelength selecting filter includes a mechanism to vary an angle with respect to the fundamental wave, thereby adjusting a transmitted wavelength, and $\Delta\lambda 2 > \Delta\lambda 1$ is satisfied, wherein $\Delta\lambda 1$ is a transmitted wavelength bandwidth for the fundamental wave in the wavelength selecting filter.

Hayakawa et al., with exemplary reference to Figure 14 contained therein, discloses a coherent light source comprising: a light source 100; a wavelength conversion element 15 that converts part of a fundamental wave emitted from light source 100 into a higher harmonic wave; and a wavelength selecting filter 91/21. However, Hayakawa et al. does not disclose a coherent light source wherein the wavelength selecting filter includes a mechanism to vary an angle with respect to the fundamental wave, thereby adjusting a transmitted wavelength, and wherein the higher harmonic wave is emitted to the outside after passing through the wavelength selecting filter as recited in claim 21. Furthermore, Hayakawa et al. does not disclose a coherent light source wherein $\Delta\lambda 2 > \Delta\lambda 1$ is satisfied, where $\Delta\lambda 1$ is a transmitted wavelength bandwidth for the fundamental wave in the wavelength selecting filter and $\Delta\lambda 2$ is a transmitted wavelength bandwidth for the higher harmonic wave in the wavelength selecting filter as recited in claim 21. Hayakawa et al. does not quantify the transmitted bandwidth of the fundamental wave or discuss its relationship to the transmitted bandwidth of the higher harmonic. Hayakawa et al. does not discuss the transmitted wavelength bandwidth for the higher harmonic at all. In view of the above, it is clear that Hayakawa et al. Does not anticipate the present invention as recited in claim 21-41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Moreover, none of the secondary references (Williams et al., Sakata et al., Furukawa et al., and Kitaoka et al.) provide the disclosure missing from Hayakawa of the elements of claim 21 Thus, no obvious combination of Hayakawa et al. with any of the secondary references would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention as recited in claim 21. Accordingly, it is respectfully

submitted that the present invention as recited in claim 21, as well as claims 22-41 which depend therefrom, are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kiminori MIZUUCHI

By: Aldo A. D'Ottavio

Registration No. 59,559 Agent for Applicant

AAD/JRF/jmj Washington, D.C. 20006-1021 Telephone (202) 721-8200 Facsimile (202) 721-8250

March 13, 2008